

**REMARKS**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner thorough review of the present application, and respectfully request reconsideration in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

FIG. 2B is added to show examples of the patterns of the surfaces of the rubber magnet to overcome the objection of the drawings and the corresponding paragraphs are also amended to identify the new figures. No new matter was introduced, as the as-filed specification and drawings provided support for the added figure.

Regarding claim 1, the surface (92) of the rubber magnet (9) described in Ishizuka (U.S. Patent 6,172,439) does not contain a pattern as the at least one first pattern of claim 1. Specifically, the elements (10) shown in Fig. 3 of Ishizuka represent a plurality of bonded portions that do not define a pattern, as illustrated by the examples of Figs. 3A and 3B of this invention. For at least this reason, claim 1 is not anticipated by Ishizuka. In addition, Fig. 2 of Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent 5,777,415) and Fig. 3 of Teshima et al. (U.S. Patent 5,783,880) fail to show that the surface of the magnet has at least one first pattern. Thus, for the same reason, it is submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated by either Suzuki et al. or Teshima et al.


Regarding claims 1-6, the protrusions (303) shown in Fig. 1 of Hsu (U.S. Patent 6,140,736) are not the same as the at least one first pattern of claim 1 in the present invention. Each protrusion (303) is engaged with each recess (312) for firmly coupling the magnetic conductor (30) in the cylinder member (31), for preventing loosening of the magnetic conductor (30) from the cylinder member (31), as described in Hsu. Thus, the surface of the magnet disclosed by Hsu does not have the claimed pattern. Additionally, the protrusion (303) does not function as the at least one first pattern of claim 1 of the present invention. The pattern in claim 1 of the invention can increase the flexibility of the magnet and thus improve flatness and fitness. On the other hand, Horng (U.S. Patent 6,362,551) does not disclose any pattern as shown in its FIGs. 1 and 4. Thus, the embodiments of claims 1-6 are not taught nor suggested by either the teachings of Hsu or Horng.

Regarding claim 7, although Couture et al. (U.S. Patent 5,753,991) disclose an embossing pattern, Couture et al.'s teachings do not relate to the subject matter of the claimed invention, and thus would not motivate one of skill in the art to arrive at the presently claimed invention. The combined teachings of Couture et al., Hus and Horng likewise fail to teach or suggested the presently claimed invention.

Accordingly, for at least the aforementioned reasons, claims 1-7 are believed to be patentable over the cited art of record. A notice of allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 749-6903. If any other fees are due in connection with filing this amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No JLINP160). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,  
MARTINE & PENILLA, LLP



Albert S. Penilla, Esq.  
Reg. No. 39,487

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 170  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085  
Telephone: (408) 749-6900  
Facsimile: (408) 749-6901

**IN THE DRAWINGS**

A new drawing page, showing formal drawing figures 2A and 2B is being submitted along with this response. The Examiner is requested to make this drawing sheet of record. No new matter is introduced.